

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE CONFIRMATION NO. 07/31/2003 81421-4031 2816 Kjeld Hermansen 10/633,396 **EXAMINER** 08/12/2004 28765 7590 WINSTON & STRAWN COE, SUSAN D PATENT DEPARTMENT ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1400 L STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3502 1654

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•		
	Application No. Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	10/633,396	HERMANSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan D. Coe	1654	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	– action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>			
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ul>	5) Notice of Informal P		O-152)

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-22 are currently pending. Please take notice of the election of species requirement beginning at paragraph 3. To be fully responsive, applicant must fulfill this requirement.

## Election/Restrictions

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1-13 and 20-22, drawn to a composition and a method for making the composition, classified in class 424, subclass 757.
  - II. Claims 14-17, drawn to a method of treating diabetes or a method for reducing the influx of cholesterol or triglycerides into the arterial wall of a diabetic subject, classified in class 424, subclass 757.
  - III. Claims 18 and 19, drawn to a method for treating cardiovascular disease, classified in class 424, subclass 757.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Invention I is related to inventions II and II as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used for a different purpose such as the use of dietary fiber to treat constipation.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different

Art Unit: 1654

functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions. The function of invention II is treat diabetes. The function of invention III is to treat cardiovascular disease. These different functions show that the inventions are distinct.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for one group is not required for the other groups, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1654

3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A) one substance selected from steviol, isosteviol, glucosteviol, gymnemic acid, steviolbioside, stevioside, Rebaudioside A, Rebaudioside B, Rebaudioside C, Rebaudioside D, Rebaudioside E, or Dulcoside A;

- B) one isoflavone selected from genistein, daidzein, glycitein, or equol;
- C) one effect selected from improved glucose tolerance, increased insulin sensitivity, reduced serum glucose levels or improved insulin secretion; and
- D) one cardiovascular disease selected from hypertriglyceridaemia, hypercholesterolaemia, hypertension, hyperglycaemia, hyperinsulinaemia, arteriosclerosis, atherosclerosis, angina pectoris, thrombosis, or myocardial infarction.

If applicant elects group I, applicant is required to select a species from A and B. If applicant elects group II, applicant is required to selected a species from A, B, and C. If applicant elects group II, applicant is required to selected a species from A, B, and D. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

An example of a proper election is: Group II; species A: steviol; species B: genistein; species C: improved glucose tolerance.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable

Art Unit: 1654

thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Coe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0963. The

Art Unit: 1654

examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 8:00 to 5:30 and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell, can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Susan D. Coe, Examiner

July 28, 2004